## **Phil 122 – Winter 2025**

Gila Sher

gsher@ucsd.edu

T,Th 5-6:20 PM

Office Hour: Th 2-3 PM Dept of Phil, room 0482

## **Topic: Logical Consequence**

Prerequisite: Phil 120 or the instructor's permission

Grades: Midterm (1/3), Final (2/3)

Textbook: G. Sher – *Logical Consequence* (Bookstore)

Integrity Requirements in Force

## **Schedule of Classes & Readings:**

T 1	1/7	Introduction to Class
Th 1	1/9	The Idea of Logical Consequence and other Preparatory Issues: Section 1 (pp. 1-4)
T 1	1/14	Tarski's Route from Truth to Logical Consequence: Section 2 (Opening), 2.1, 2.2 (pp. 4-8)
Th 1	1/16	Fundamental Adequacy Conditions and Failure of Substitutional Definition: 2.3, 2.4 (pp. 8-11)
T 1	1/21	The Semantic, Model-Theoretic Definition: 2.5 (pp. 11-21)
Th 1	1/23	Cont.
T 1	1/28	Adequacy and Challenges: 2.6 (pp. 21-26)
Th 1	1/30	Partial Solution to the Necessity and Formality Challenges; Methodology; Preparation for Midterm: 3.1, 3.2 (pp. 26-29)
T 2	2/4	Midterm
Th 2	2/6	General Invariantist Solution to the Logicality Challenge: 3.3 (pp. 29-40)
T 2	2/11	Cont.

Th 2/13	General Invariantist Solution to the Necessity and Formality Challenges: 3.4 (pp. 40-45)
T 2/18	Philosophical Foundation of Logic and Features of Logical Consequence: 4.1, 4.2 (pp. 46-51)
Th 2/20	The Normativity of Logic; the Status of the Invariance Criterion: 4.3, 4.4 (pp. 51-54)
T 2/25	The Scope of Logic, Bivalence, and the Relation between Logic and Mathematics 4.5, 4.6 (pp. 54-60)
Th 2/27	Important Metalogical Theorems (including Completeness and Incompleteness); Confusions concerning Tarski: 4.7, 4.8 (pp. 60-64)
T 3/4	Etchemendy's Criticism of the Semantic Definition of Logical Consequence and Response: Section 5 (opening), 5.1 (pp. 65-69)
Th 3/6	Field's Criticism of the Semantic Definition of Logical Consequence and Responses: 5.2 (pp. 69-72)
T 3/11	Criticisms of the Isomorphism-Invariance Criterion of Logicality and Responses: Section 6 (opening), 6.1, 6.2 (pp. 72-85)
Th 3/13	Cont.; Preparation for Final